



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

De Contractionis et Synizeseos usu Homericō scripsit IOS. MENRAD. Monachii, 1886. Pp. 216.

No more striking example of the tendency of recent Homeric criticism can be adduced than the effort to expel from the text of Homer vowel-contractions and synizeses. As early as the days of Bentley *ὑμῖν μὲν θεοί*, A 18 (cf. § 251), grated on an ear not unaccustomed to this synizesis in the Attic poets; and the conjecture of the "modern Aristarchus"—*ὑμμι θεοὶ μὲν*—has now found a place in the edition of Christ.

The violent resolutions of contract forms in the edition of Payne Knight excite more curiosity than respect, though his text contains not a few acceptable emendations (e. g. κ 240, *ἐν νόος*; Ξ 140, *γηθέει ἐν*). With Bekker the tendency to avoid contractions did not assume the pronounced character of later times. Bekker was on the scent for instances of violated *ῥ*, and did not shrink from *καὶ αὖν φωνήσασα φέπτα*, as he did not from *δίνεον ὥς, χρύσειον, ἄφρεον*. As the desire to disturb the serenity of traditional possession grew apace, there arose scholars like Nauck, who substituted the uncontracted for the contracted forms whenever etymology and the rhythm of the verse permitted—that is, when the contracted syllable was in the thesis. By the adoption of this canon Nauck was the first to attempt the enforcement of a "blood-and-iron" rule which, if carried into uniform practice, would have deprived the poet of any liberty of choice. But it was not till the advent of Fick's *Odyssey* that Homeric scholarship began to recognize the ultimate consequences that might be drawn from the rigorous enforcement of the doctrine of avoidance of contractions; especially when cases of contraction which refused all emendation were proclaimed to be the work of a particular individual, Kynaethus, an Ionian of the sixth century.

Contemporaneous with this hunt after uniformity on the basis of a separation of our text into an Aeolic and an Ionic Homer, is the mediating effort of Christ, whose scholar, Menrad, has now given to the world the most thorough-going, as it is in many respects the most satisfactory, treatise on this subject that has yet appeared.

Any investigation which deals with vowel-contraction in Homer must have a twofold aim: it must strive to attain a more exact knowledge of the laws of the hexameter, while it respects the laws already known, and it must indirectly hope to prove a powerful factor in the effort to determine the age of particular portions of the epos.

The difficulties in the path of the investigator are numerous. In the first place, contractions which appear to be criteria of the younger portions of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* uncharitably reappear in portions which have been fixed upon by the consentient verdict of scholars as of earlier date. Again, the language of the earliest bards may have permitted metrical licenses to an

extent indeterminable by us; or the rhapsodes may have preserved open syllables as archaisms when their contraction was an accomplished fact for their own day. These and many other difficulties beset Dr. Menrad in the course of his study; nor is he unaware of their variety or momentousness.

The lines on which he attacks the problem may thus be summarized: Contractions and synizeses are, as a rule, absent from the older portions of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Their presence is to be regarded as a proof of more recent origin, except (1) when metrical reasons necessitate a contraction of too great a concurrence of short vowels in a word that would otherwise have been banished from epic use; or (2) when the contracted syllable occurs at the end of the hexameter (but Menrad refuses to make use of this exception to explain *Αχλλεῖ*, Ψ 792; cf. p. 17); or (3) when the contraction occurs in the chief caesura of the verse. Vowels originally separated by *yod* contract with greatest readiness, less frequently those between which *σ* has been expelled; but the loss of *F* is followed by contraction in comparatively few instances. Vowels of cognate nature contract easily (*πληθύνει, τεθνήσκει*), as do those of different weight (*πασέων*), but those of different coloring or of equal weight contract with less freedom (*ἐνίκασον, ἐπέθρεον*).

In his reply to the strictures of Müllenhof on his *Sprachschatz*, Grein delimited with admirable precision the functions of a critic who differs on principle from the views which he has been called upon to submit to examination. Here, if ever, the critic must not use as a weapon against the details or elaboration of a theory any objection to the theory as a whole that may be with him a matter of philological conscience. Scholars of the beliefs of Ludwig will thus condemn as a whole a volume which aims at carrying the principles of Christ to their ultimate results, and which regards Nauck's position as but slightly removed from that occupied by the Munich professor. But others, whose consciences are seared by the resolve to break away from the trammels of tradition, will be more sympathetically inclined to an investigator who seeks to formulate laws on the basis of so reasonable a position as the mediating one of Christ. The latter class accept the attempt as a possible one, and will find reason to object to errors of judgment only in the working out of the theory or to mere errors of detail.

Among the latter the reviewer begs leave to count himself; and with the greater satisfaction, as in a treatise written now some four years ago (*Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen*) he had occasion to deal in part with the same problems discussed so ably by Dr. Menrad. In the course of an investigation of the diaeresis in Homer the reviewer proposed (p. 42), on the basis of a complete collection of material, the following law, which has been accepted in some quarters in Germany: *ēi* from *εσι* (not from *εφι*) is contracted to *ēi* in Homer only when a short syllable precedes and follows this *ελ*. All passages (and they are very few) that are not in harmony with this statement have (1) either already been condemned or are to be condemned as of later origin, or (2) are to be corrected if their genuineness is not, on other grounds, elevated beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt. It is a matter of satisfaction to the reviewer that this conclusion is in part the same as that reached by Dr. Menrad, who had not seen the above-mentioned pamphlet. The conjectures which he suggests in order to introduce *ēi* into the dat. loc. sing. of the *-ετ*-stems are the same as those previously made by the reviewer, with the exception of γ 91, where for

εἰ τε καὶ ἐν πέλαγῳ μετὰ κύμασιν Ἀμφιτρίτης, εἰ τε καὶ ἄμ πέλαγος was suggested; cf. ε 330, ὧς τὴν ἄμ πέλαγος ἄνεμοι φέρον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα. Menrad, however, suggests ἐν πέλαγεσσι. In one point, however, Menrad's opinion differs. Accepting the resolution in ἀεικείη, ἀφνειός, ἡθείος, he excuses forms like ἡριγένεια, τέλειος on the ground that they occur at the end of the verse. ἡθείος K 37; ἀφνειός I 483, he explains as evidences of the later origin of K and I; and adopts the same excuse for ἀφνειότεροι, α 165; ἀφνειότατος, Υ 220; τελειότατον, Θ 247, Ω 315. But for ἀφνειός, E 9 (Δάρης ἀφνειός ἀμύμων), he can give no explanation. Here, I hold, it will be necessary to read κρατερὸς καὶ ἀμύμων (cf. γ III, Σ 55) since, whenever ἀφνειός occurs in conjunction with ἀμύμων, καὶ is interposed (cf. α 232). I agree with Menrad as regards α 165, Υ 220, I 483 (Düntzer rejected 481-484 on other grounds), but in the case of τέλειος, A 66, Ω 34; τελειότατον, Θ 247, Ω 315, and in the case of Τριτογένεια, which is omitted by Menrad, I still prefer to see the operation of the above-mentioned law. If my position be correct, Menrad has not utilized his material to the best possible advantage. But this is a point of comparatively slight importance. I prefer to follow him in regarding καταπρηνεῖ, Π 792, ν 164, as a poetical license, than to accept Fick's καταπρανέ' ἐλάσας in ν 164 (Aeolic καταπρανέ' ἐλάσαις). Fick rejects Π 648-804; προαλεῖ Φ 262 belongs to the μαχὴ παραποτάμους and Ἐυπείθει occurs in ω 465.

The exhaustive collection of material is arranged under the following heads: Declension of nouns and pronouns; verbs in -αω, -εω; future and subjunctive; -αι, -εο, -αο; verbs in -οω; verbs in -μι; εἰμί; isolated examples of more remarkable contractions and synizeses. An introduction discusses the labors of his predecessors, an epimetrum contains an impatient attack upon Ludwig, of whose set he exclaims, perhaps unjustly: *Sed frustra ad rationes revoces homines, qui rationes ut eludant, doctrina et acumine utuntur*. Finally, the weaknesses of Fick's practical application of his Aeolic theory are emphasized by several, to my thinking, well-timed objections.

Menrad submits to an examination each case of contraction in Iliad and Odyssey, and to those passages which, in his judgment, need curative treatment, offers both his own emendations and those of other scholars. To many of the several hundred suggestions which are the result of his fertility of resource in conjectural emendation we must award our assent (so, for example, εὐέργων, Π 743, for εὐεργέος; φ 178, ἐκ δὲ στήῃτος οἶσε μέγαν τρόχον), and to most at least the verdict of subtlety. But it soon becomes apparent how easy it is to rewrite Homer in the light of any one theory enforced by the "Reign of Thorough," especially if we lessen our burden by assuming the irresponsible position that it is not necessary to account in each case for the source of the traditional reading.

It was no new fact that vowels are far more frequently contracted in the later than in the earlier portions of the epos. It is only when the antiquity of a passage is in dispute that the utmost delicacy of touch is pre-eminently necessary. Herein the editor as the investigator, whose functions are often widely divergent, should agree; and herein Menrad has failed to display that *finesse* of criticism without which investigations of purely grammatical scope must ever be barren of lasting results. Conjectures in a text which is a mosaic of the lost lays of different epochs should be made only under the following

conditions: (1) when the forms are non-Hellenic and caused by the ignorance of transcribers or of redactors who were devoid of any finer sense of Homeric form; (2) when the laws of the hexameter suffer a patent violation;<sup>1</sup> (3) when the sense imperatively demands another reading. With all due reverence for the Königsberg school, there is room and verge enough for the adoption of many ancient forms from those MSS which do not contain mere conjectures of the scribes.

And again: if we break away from MS tradition we may introduce archaic forms, not because they are archaic, but because an examination of all the parallel cases in the light of the most exact study of the age of the different portions of the epos warrants their adoption. It is in violation of this latter principle that Menrad has committed his great, and let us add his only, fault of any ulterior consequence. With all his desire to gather results for the age of different passages of the poems (cf. pp. 62, 89, 134, 137), the thralldom of a single guiding principle has vitiated a vision otherwise keen and well trained. But for the proofs! Ψ 792 Menrad reads πόσος' ἐριδαίνεσθαι ἄλλοις' εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλῇ in a passage indisputably of later date (the personal construction of ἀργαλέος is here impossible). Ἡοῦς is to be excused, according to Menrad, from its place in the Telemachy (δ 188), but αἰδοῦς must be corrected (ν 171), as if ν was older than δ. ο is indirectly asserted to be of greater antiquity than η, since in ο 533, ἡμετέρων δ' οὐκ ἔστι γένευσ βασιλεύτερον ἄλλο, for γένευσ we must read γένος; θέρευσ occurs in η 118 (description of the gardens of Alkinoos). We had cherished the belief that the appearance of Helea in ο savored somewhat of a later age, but even the isolated νεῖσθαι (ο 88)—there are 55 cases of νεῖσθαι—must be corrected; and that when the whole environment is redolent of a later age (e. g. either ν. 65 or ν. 80 must be spurious). οὐκ ἔθ' ὁμῶς τιμῆς ἔσσαι πόλεμόν περ ἀλαλκῶν in the oration of Phoenix, well known as occurring in a later insertion, I ν. 605, is to be emended to τίμιος οὐκέθ' ὁμῶς ἔσσαι, πόλεμόν περ ἀλαλκῶν. In the *Shield of Achilles*, Σ 475, καὶ χρυσὸν τιμήνῃα καὶ ἄργυρον becomes τιμήνῃα τῷ χρυσῷ ἰδ' ἄργυρον. The later origin of Iliad IX is ignored and Menrad's aim to separate the older from the later lays vitiated by his conjectures I 315 (Ἄτρεΐδην πείσειν Ἀγαμέμνον' οἶω), I 337 (τί δέφει), Ω 290 (ἀλλὰ σὺν' εὐχ' ἔπειτα), despite Ω 287 εὐχεο. The fact of the existence of εὐχεο and εὐχεν in such close proximity proves, that for the period in which Ω was composed, both forms were a portion of the apparatus of the poet. In the Elpenor scene, λ 61 is emended from ἄσε μέ δαίμονος αἶσα to ἄσας με Διὸς αἶσα, because δαίμονος αἶσα occurs nowhere else (*haud scio an religione ductus is sit qui culpam a Iove in semideum quendam infernum transferendum esse censeret!*)

It is, perhaps, no difficult matter to catch a conjectural critic at variance with himself. But the following is so glaring a case of inconsistency that it well deserves the words of Cauer: *Ich behaupte nicht dass so entgegengesetzte Wirkungen an sich unmöglich seien; aber sie müssten in jedem einzelnen Falle erst bewiesen werden, nicht sie selbst können als Beweismittel für eine weitere Annahme verwertet werden.* Menrad emends B 328, ὥς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα to ὥς ἡμεῖς τόσα μὲν ἔτεα, the rare το(σ)σοῦτος (I 485, Ψ 476, and here) having expelled the more common τόσος. For δφρ' εἰδῆς, Θ 420, etc., long an irritant to F hunters, ὥς

<sup>1</sup> A distinct weakness of Menrad's conjectures is that he does not shrink from the trochaic caesura of the fourth foot, which occurs only fifteen times in A-O.

Εὐθέως is substituted, as if a partially final particle as ὥς (Il. 31, Od. 32 times) could have been displaced by the more frequent ὅφρα (Il. 117, Od. 120 times), even though we take into consideration the fact that ὥς κε, ὥς ἄν are more frequent than ὅφρα κε, ὅφρ' ἄν (A. J. P. IV 423 ff.).

Pursued without greater discriminative insight, treatises similar to Menrad's must ever recall the admirable words of Moriz Haupt (quoted by Kammer, *Neue Phil. Rundschau* 1887, No. 8)—*Absolut ist in der Kritik alles zu verwerfen was nicht nothwendig ist; mit Möglichkeiten hat die Wissenschaft nichts zu thun, darum muss man sich vollkommen unempfindlich verhalten gegen den Reiz sogenannter geistreicher Kombinationen, sonst artet die Wissenschaft, die ein Suchen der strengen Wahrheit sein soll, in ein Spiel der Phantasie aus.*

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

The Sequence of Tenses in Latin. By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology.) 1887.

In the last number of this Journal Professor Hale completed his essay on the Sequence of Tenses in Latin, in which he advocated the thesis that the 'tenses of the Latin subjunctive, alike in dependent and in independent sentences, tell their own temporal story, that no such thing as is meant by the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses exists.' The thesis is not new, the principle on which the thesis rests is not new. What is new is the amplitude, the fervor of the presentation. I leave to other hands the discussion of the individual examples by which Professor Hale has undertaken to fortify his position, and content myself with a few remarks on the general principles involved.

Doubtless the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses is often badly stated. The grammarian often sacrifices exactness to brevity. He says 'case' when he means 'case-form.' He says 'tense' when he means 'time.' He says 'governs' when he means 'is construed with.' He says 'follows' when he means 'is associated with.' All that the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses means is that when you have to do with present or future time you use the so-called principal tenses of the subj.; when you have to do with past time you use the so-called historical tenses of the subjunctive; and that as the subjunctive is chiefly used in dependent sentences, the point of view is regularly given by the principal clause—with due regard to the attraction of parenthetic clauses, with due regard to the shifting of the conception. Granted that the principal clause has no direct effect on the subordinate, this coincidence is every way worth noting, and in the absence of a more satisfactory theory of the temporal relation of the subjunctive than prevails just now, it has a practical use that is not to be despised, apart from considerations to be afterwards adduced. Even as a rule of thumb it has a far wider sweep than one would suppose from the exceptions that Professor Hale has brought forward—many of them dear old friends that we have long valued for the vividness with which they protest against the tendency of language to run into grooves, against that ovine tendency so marked in the human race, and not less marked in the grammatical tribe than in the other sorts and conditions of men. A patient German, Heynacher by name,<sup>1</sup> has been at the pains of counting the sequences

<sup>1</sup> I quote from Fügner (Fleck. Jahrbücher, 1887, Paedag. Abth. S. 115). The second ed. of Heynacher's book is not accessible to me.